STP-LOCAL LESSONS LEARNED

McHenry County Council of Mayors Meeting
November 19, 2020

AGENDA

- Overview of methodology
- Analysis of scoring
- Methodology Review Committee

Throughout: we'll be looking at possible areas of improvement that staff have noticed.

PREVIOUS METHODOLOGY

PROJECT TYPES

ROADWAY & INTERSECTION

- Intersection Channelization
- Roadway Widening
- New Roadway Construction
- Roadway Reconstruction
- Traffic Signals, Modifications, and/or modernization
- Bicycle or Pedestrian Facilities
- Modern Roundabout (including mini roundabouts)

RESURFACING

- LAFOs
- Resurfacings

PROJECT TYPES

Any other project types that should be included?

SPECIFIC POLICIES

- \$1.5 million cap
- Two project limit per community
- Funding eligibility
 - Phase I, 50/50
 - Phase II, 50/50
 - ROW, not funded
 - Construction, 80/20

- Community Cohorts for equity criteria
 - Cohort I − 0 points
 - Cohort 2 4 points
 - Cohort 3 5 points
 - Cohort 4 6 points

SPECIFIC POLICIES

Any modifications to existing policies that you'd like to see?

Any additional policies?

Any policies that should be removed?

SCORING CRITERIA

Project Evaluation Criteria - Roadways and Intersection Projects

	Project Scoring Categories	100 points total		
		and Intersection Projects		
1.	Traffic Volume – Average Daily Traffic	Two Lane Road	Four Lane Road	
	(ADT) (15 points max)	_ADT = Points	_ADT_ = Points	
		1000	2000	
2.	Safety Need (12 points)	Critical	+1	
		High	+	
	Based on IDOT Safety Tiers (SRI)	Medium	+	
		Low	+	
		Minimal		
3.	Safety Improvement (4 points)	Above 50%		
		36%-49%		
	Based on the maximum crash reduction	26%-35%		
	factor (CRF) associated with proposed	15%-25%		
	project countermeasures	Under 15%		
4.	Pavement Condition (9 points)	Pavement Condition	Point Value	
		Poor (0-45)	+	
	Based on the Pavement Condition	Fair (46-60)	+	
	Testing done by CMAP (IRI,	Satisfactory (61-75)	+	
	Cracking_Percent, rutting and faulting)	Excellent (76-100)		
		New Alignment	+	
5.	Multi-modal Infrastructure Components	Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure	Cumulative Point	
	(14 points max)	Project includes multi-use path	+	
		Project includes on-street bike lanes	+	
		Project includes marked shared lanes	+	
		Project includes sidewalk	+	
_		Project adds new bus shelters	+	
6.	Project Readiness (15 points)	Phase II engineering complete (pre-	+1	
		final plans submitted to IDOT)		
		Phase II engineering contract executed	+1	
		Phase I engineering report completed;	+	
		Design approval granted		
		Phase I engineering report (PDR) draft submitted to IDOT	+	
		Phase I engineering contract entered		
		into by project applicant	+	
7	Community Cohort (6 points)	Community Cohort 4	+	
	community control to points;	Community Cohort 3	+	
	McHenry County is considered	Community Cohort 2	+	
	to be in Community Cohort 1	Community Cohort 1	-	
8	ON TO 2050 Planning Measures	Project sponsor has adopted a		
٥.	(25 points)	complete streets policy or ordinance	+1	
	/ h - · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Project uses green infrastructure to		
		manage stormwater*	+1	

Total:

Project Evaluation Criteria – Resurfacing Projects (LAFO)

	Project Scoring Categories	100 points total	
	Re	esurfacing Projects	
1.	Pavement Condition (30 points)	Pavement Condition	Point Value
	Based on the Pavement Condition	Fair (46-60)	+ 30
	Testing done by CMAP (IRI,	Satisfactory (61-75)	+ 20
	Cracking_Percent, rutting and faulting)	Poor (0-45)	+ 10
		Excellent (76-100)	0
2.	Project Readiness (10 points)	Phase II engineering complete (pre-final	+ 10
		plans submitted to IDOT)	+ 10
		Phase II engineering contract executed	+ 8
		Phase I engineering report completed;	+ 6
		Design approval granted	+ 0
		Phase I engineering report (PDR) draft	+ 4
		submitted to IDOT	+ 4
		Phase I engineering contract entered	+ 2
		into by project applicant	τ Ζ
3.	Traffic Volume – Average Daily Traffic	Two Lane Road	Four Lane Road
	(ADT) (15 points max)	<u>ADT</u> = Points	<u>ADT</u> = Points
		1000	2000
4.	Safety Need (8 points)	Critical	+ 8
		High	+ 6
	Based on IDOT Safety Tiers (SRI)	Medium	+ 4
		Low	+ 2
		Minimal	0
5.	,	Project adds or includes bicycle facilities	
	(6 points)	such as bike lanes, widened shoulders,	+ 6
		or other bicycle safety measures.	
6.	Community Cohort (6 points)	Community Cohort 4	+ 6
		Community Cohort 3	+ 5
	McHenry County is considered to be in	Community Cohort 2	+ 4
	Community Cohort 1	Community Cohort 1	0
7.	ON TO 2050 planning measures	Project sponsor has adopted a complete	+15
	(25 points)	streets policy or ordinance	.13
		Project uses green infrastructure to	+10
		manage stormwater*	.10

To	ta				

SCORING CRITERIA

What changes would you like to see with the scoring criteria?

OTHER AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT

Is there anything else we should be thinking about?

SCORING AND COHORTS

ROADWAY/INTERSECTION PROJECTS 10 TOTAL PROJECTS

Criterion	Average Points	Maximum Points
Traffic Volume	7.1	15
Safety Need	3.3	12
Safety Improvement	2.4	4
Pavement Condition	5.1	9
Multi-modal Infrastructure	9.1	14
Project Readiness	7.5	15
Community Cohort	2	6
Planning Measures	23.5	25
Total	60.00	100

RESURFACING PROJECTS 16 TOTAL PROJECTS

Criterion	Average Points	Maximum Points
Pavement Condition	25	30
Project Readiness	3.875	10
Traffic Volume	4.3	15
Safety Need	1.625	8
Bicycle Accommodations	2.625	6
Community Cohort	1.875	6
Planning Measures	21.25	25
Total	60.53	100

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Port Barrington	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Ringwood	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Spring Grove		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Trout Valley		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Union		
Lakewood	Woodstock		
McHenry			
Prairie Grove			

PROJECTS BY COMMUNITY COHORT

Cohort	Municipalities with Applications	Number of Applications			Number Awarded Funding
I	7	16	6	10	13
2	4	4	1	3	4
3	2	2	2	0	I
4	3	4	1	3	3

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Port Barrington	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Ringwood	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Spring Grove		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Trout Valley		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Union		
Lakewood	Woodstock		
McHenry			
Prairie Grove			

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Port Barrington	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Ringwood	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Spring Grove		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Trout Valley		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Union		
Lakewood	Woodstock		
McHenry			
Prairie Grove			

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Port Barrington	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Ringwood	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Spring Grove		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Trout Valley		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Union		
Lakewood	Woodstock		
McHenry			
Prairie Grove			
Spring Grove			

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Port Barrington	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Ringwood	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Spring Grove		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Trout Valley		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Union		
Lakewood	Woodstock		
McHenry			
Prairie Grove			
Spring Grove			

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Lakemoor	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Oakwood Hills	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Port Barrington		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Ringwood		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Spring Grove		
Lakewood	Trout Valley		
McHenry	Union		
Prairie Grove	Woodstock		
Spring Grove	Wonder Lake		

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Lakemoor	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Oakwood Hills	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Port Barrington		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Ringwood		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Spring Grove		
Lakewood	Trout Valley		
McHenry	Union		
Prairie Grove	Woodstock		
Spring Grove	Wonder Lake		

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4	
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood	
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard	
Cary	Greenwood	Oakwood Hills	Hebron	
Crystal Lake	Lakemoor	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills	
Huntley	Oakwood Hills		McCullom Lake	
Johnsburg	Port Barrington		Richmond	
Lake in the Hills	Ringwood			
Lakewood	Spring Grove			
McHenry	Trout Valley			
Prairie Grove	Union			
Spring Grove	Woodstock			
	W onder Lake			

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Greenwood	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Lakemoor	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Oakwood Hills		McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Port Barrington		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Ringwood		
Lakewood	Spring Grove		
McHenry	Trout Valley		
Prairie Grove	Union		
Spring Grove	Woodstock		
	W onder Lake		

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Greenwood	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Lakemoor	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Oakwood Hills	Richmond	McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Port Barrington		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Ringwood		
Lakewood	Spring Grove		
McHenry	Trout Valley		
Prairie Grove	Union		
Spring Grove	Woodstock		
	W onder Lake		

Cohort I	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
Algonquin	Bull Valley	Lakemoor	Greenwood
Barrington Hills	Fox River Grove	Marengo	Harvard
Cary	Greenwood	Oakwood Hills	Hebron
Crystal Lake	Lakemoor	Wonder Lake	Holiday Hills
Huntley	Oakwood Hills	Richmond	McCullom Lake
Johnsburg	Port Barrington		Richmond
Lake in the Hills	Ringwood		
Lakewood	Spring Grove		
McHenry	Trout Valley		
Prairie Grove	Union		
Spring Grove	Woodstock		
	W onder Lake		

PROJECTS BY COMMUNITY POPULATION

Population	Municipalities with Applications	Number of Applications	Number of Roadway Projects	Number of Resurfacing Projects	Percent Awarded Funding
Under 1,000	2	2	I	1	100
1,001-5,000	5	6	0	6	100
5,001-10,000	4	5	2	3	60
10,001-15,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
15,001-20,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
20,001-25,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
25,001-30,000	4	8	2	6	75
30,000 or more	2	5	5	0	60

REVIEW COMMITTEES

METHODOLOGY REVIEW COMMITTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS

- Last year's methodology was approved in September
- Need Council members to join the review committee
- Committee will review:
 - Scoring criteria
 - Point values
 - Project eligibility
- Last year, the Committee met in March, April, and June
 - Proposed schedule: January, March, May, July, prior to that month's MCCOM meeting

METHODOLOGY REVIEW COMMITTEE COUNCIL MEMBERS

- January meeting: establish schedule, discuss previous call and methodology, think about potential goals for 2022
- March meeting: review project type eligibility, phase funding eligibility, other eligibility criteria
- May meeting: review scoring criteria to keep, modify, add, or remove
- July meeting: review point values for scoring criteria
- Approval in September
- Staff will provide supplemental information for each meeting.

METHODOLOGY REVIEW COMMITTEE CONSULTANTS

- **February**: update on what Council members talked about in January, discuss last year's methodology and areas for improvement
- April: discuss bigger picture issues such as concerns with project eligibility, policies, etc.
- August: review scoring criteria and point values based on Council member feedback

THANK YOU!